

REMARKS

The present communication is in response to the Official Action mailed April 20, 2006. A petition for a three-month extension of the term for response to said Official Action, to and including October 20, 2006, is transmitted herewith.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1, 2 and 4-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because "they do not recite statutory subject matter."

Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 to clarify that the message is transmittable so as to distribute information among a plurality of traders at a plurality of sites.

Applicants have amended claim 23 to clarify that the program is encoded on a computer-readable medium. Claim 24 has been amended to clarify that the apparatus includes a program encoded on a computer-readable medium for execution on a computer.

Applicants submit that claims 1, 2 and 4-25 meet statutory requirements. Thus, for at least these reasons, applicants request the § 101 rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Owens et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,633,630 (hereinafter "Owens").

A feature of the present invention can be generally stated as a message translator which performs message translation functions when no rules are provided for processing the message. Thus, as explained at page 39, line 28 to page 40, line 5, and shown in Figs. 5 and 6 of the present application, a

message translator may execute a message translation function when no rules are provided for message processing of the message. The message translation function may include checking sentence construction of the message and performing translation of the message. Thus, the message may be processed in the absence of business rules.

Independent claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15 and 21-25 have been amended hereby to emphasize the message translation feature. That is, when no rules are provided for processing the message, the message translation feature may check sentence construction of the message and perform translation of the message.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-2, 5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21-25.

Owens relates to a communication system that is intended to integrate different systems such as e-mail, voicemail and fax communication systems to allow access to all communications systems from a single access point.

It is respectfully submitted that *Owens* fails to disclose the feature of the present invention that includes a message translation feature that, when no rules are provided processing the message, checks sentence construction of the message and performs translation of the message as recited in amended independent claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15 and 21-25.

The Examiner rejected dependent claim 2 which recites "wherein when no suitable rules exist in the rule accumulation part a part that starts a corresponding application to execute the message conversion processing is included." In discussing this rejection, the Examiner referred to lines 62-64 of column 10 of *Owens* and asserted that such portion of *Owens* discloses "message conversion when no suitable rules exist." Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, it is respectfully submitted that such portion of *Owens* refers to processing a

voice message based on some rules. For example, the voice message is not forwarded but instead held in a repository. That is, in such portion of *Owens*, the message is processed according to some predefined rules. In contrast, as recited in amended claim 1, a message translator is provided, wherein when no rules are provided for processing the message, checks sentence construction of the message and performs translation of the message. Such a feature of the present invention is not disclosed in the portion of *Owens* relied on by the Examiner. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention as recited by claims 1-2, 5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21-25 is not anticipated by *Owens* for at least the above reasons.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6, 13 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Owens* in view of *Matsuo*, U.S. Patent No. 5,634,005 (hereinafter "*Matsuo*").

Claims 6, 13 and 20 depend from claims 1, 8 and 15 respectively, which independent claims are thought to be patentably distinct over *Owens* for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner appears to only rely on *Matsuo* for disclosing features of dependent claims 6, 13 and 20. It is respectfully submitted that the portions of *Matsuo* relied upon by the Examiner do not appear to fix the deficiencies of *Owens* relating to the message translation features recited in the amended independent claims.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met by the foregoing amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicant's attorney at

(908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: October 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Arthur S. Ortega
Registration No.: 53,422
LERNER, DAVID, LITTBENBERG,
KRMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

694671_1.DOC